G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references

1919.

Mis 225-12-4 (Misc)

Later references (Scale revision)

Misc. 192-23-1-10

292-27-1-4

File No. 571-19

Serial Nos. 1-12

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for Feb 22

SUBJECT.

Re installing the Anjaneya deity at the Sri Rama Devara Chathram at Bisle Manjarabad Taluk

---

G. Narayan No 4402 Dy 13.2.22

(Returns the bill for

Rs. for repairs

WD 1888—GPB—16,826—23-7 21

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

( )

NOTES

File No. 571-15

FILE HEADING.

Estimate for Rs 146/- for reinstalling the Deity in the Sri Ramadevaru Chattram at Manjarabai Dalek

From

Dy: Comr:, Hassan Dist

No. 2137-16 Dated 15.3.20 Received

Diary No. 1787] Enclos 2 Spare Copies [Serial No /

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Forwards for sanction an estimate for reinstalling the "Anjaneya" Deity in the Ramadevaru Chattram at

NOTES AND ORDERS

The Dy: Comr's letter gives the facts of the case. The points requiring orders are two:-

(1) Estimate for Rs 146/- for reinstalling the Anjaneya" Deity in the chattram.

(2) ~~Prov~~ Provision of Rs 60/- from out of the

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 571 of 1919.

Serial No.

VP

tasdik grant of the chattram for the pay of the archak and paditara deeparadhane of the deity - the statement received with the Dy: Comrs letter shows the items of expenditure against the tasdik grant of Rs. 10 4 4 per annum -

2 The necessity for the above two items is explained in the Dy: Comrs letter.

~~Subd draft sanctioning for orders.~~

3 The Amildar and the S. D. O. propose to pay the archak at Rs 10/- p m and the Paditara Deeparadhane cost at Rs 5/- p.m. The D. C. has proposed Rs 10/- for both together.

Subd for orders -

22.3.20

4 Previous reference not put up -.

5 I now put up file No 200 of 1892-3. Relating to re-construction of Bodle Chattram (it was among Banahalli Samsthanam papers)

6 Please note - When the idol was removed to ~~London~~ Bhootadkoor put up Complete Note

23/3/20

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

ST 23/3

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | Mug File No. 571 of 1919

Serial No.

B

7 In Letter no. 601 & 8-3-1890 from the Dy: Comr, Hassan Dt, a reference is made to the temple ~~in the Sandpet~~ in the chattram. It has not been explained either in the present letter of the Dy: Comr or any of the previous papers why the presiding deity of the chattram was not removed to the new chattram soon after it was built.

8 The recorded file 128-12 containing G.O. no. 542-44/Mug 125-12-4 & 15-8-13 is put up. for reference ~~to~~ with the question of enhancement of grant to Barahazar Santarpane, which is before the H. Secy.

8D
29-3-20 ~~29-3-20~~

9 Attention is invited to G.O. no. [illegible] & 3 March 1910 from the D.C., Hassan Dt. ~~recommending~~ submitting an estimate for Rs 13812/- for reconstructing the Bridle Chattram. Mention is made to have fallen down several years ago and held in temporary shed after same correspondence ~~abstract~~ a revised estimate for Rs 17,433 has been received, the charge being made as follows:-

Rs 10299 from the Chattram funds and Rs 7134 from local funds [illegible]

NOTE—Contn sheet

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Rev — File No. 571 of 1919.

Serial No.

The work was done by the D P W

10 It will be seen from para 2 of the Dy Comr's letter ref. to above that reference was made to two deities viz (temples) of Subrahmanya and an image (idol) ~~of~~ existing in the centre of the mantapa

11 In the present letter (Paper under disposal) the Dy Comr says that there was an Anjaneya deity in the N) chamber that it was removed (kept) there & that thereafter the charges for Puja & Archana allowed therein were discontinued. He makes no mention of the Subrahmanya deity resp. to which his predecessor..

12 It is not clear who removed the deities, and under what authority & where they are kept there & where it is proposed to find ample space for the residence of the deity and that the latter is said to have been under correspondence with the Mysore Govt. now the revised estimate is Rs 1146 for reinstallation..

13 The present Dy Comr recommends that sanction may be accorded to the establishment of an archak on Rs 3 per mensem, total Rs 36 per month or Rs 432 per year & recurring from Rents Vance Fund vide No 542-4 mem 225-1 & 15-8-13. (Note Nat. Purohit by Comr)

NOTE—Contn sheet.

X.H.V.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. | of 191

Serial No.

14 attention is invited to page 2 ; the notes in file 200 of 92 93 where Rs 2 [illegible] is shown as the value of rice the allowed for the purchase of the average quality (i.e the steam price with condiments &c).

15 It is not clear whether since the date of removal of the duty this allowance has been raised, reduced or kept; and if so whether it has been brought under savings.

16 If approved, definite information may be called for on these points for the Dy Comr.

31/3/20

The File No 200 of 1892-3 herewith put up relates to the Re-Construction of the Kodaikanal Ave Estimate for Rs 17433/- was sanctioned in March 1896. The work was carried out by the PW Dept & completed in Aug 1899 +.

Fl. C.

Fl. D -

As regards the Temples in the Old Chatram building. provision was made for them in the Estimate for the New Chatram

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

H. S.

as will be seen from the Jt. extract from D/Com^r letter no 601/S dt 3. March 90.

"In the Centre of the Court yard fronting the entrance is a place is provided for the temple as at present. There is a Sitramana Swami & another Anjaneya. I believe placed there being worshipped and enjoying a Jaedili also from ancient time the establishment of the Chattram. The building will be wtfed with Manglore Tiles. the walls will be of brick building & and plastered over & purlin wood from the Shant forests will be extensively used"

H. E.

Perusing the Office Memo. in the file, it will be seen that one Seer of rice was to be given a day in the alms accorded to the Hyderabad Temple.

The Dr now reports that "When the new Chattram was built, the idol was removed & kept elsewhere & consequently the Charges for Puja & Paditharai allowed thereon was discontinued".

2/ The Dr does not report whether

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2)

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. | of 191

Serial No.

when, by whom & whether the order was removed & where it actually is now

The Pooja & Padutana allowance mentioned by the Dr commissioner ~~[illegible]~~ of rice a day. This was perhaps stopped, when the feeding shed had to be stopped ~~[illegible]~~ about the year 189

~~When the feeding was~~ was revived ~~after~~ on the completion of the new Chattram building, the ~~Rice allowance~~

The feeding was revived on the completion of the new Chattram in 1899. Why then, the Rice allowance for Anjaneya Pooja was not revived is a matter which calls for enquiry.

It is also important that tho' it is more than 20 years since the new building was constructed, the present question about the Anjaneya Swami Temple was not raised till now.

The Dr is silent about the other ~~[illegible]~~ duty mentioned in the letter by Mr Subramania Swami.

NOTE—Contn sheet

G. R S. III-2)

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 191

Serial No.

A sum of Rs 10 proposed for Padtana expenses appears to be ~~a bit~~ rather too liberal

AMS 1.4.20

2 days)

27. Call for explanation

US 5/4/20

SD 5/4

AMS 5-4-20

28. Draft letter subd

SD 6-4-20

AMS 6/4/20 17.4.

2 days)

29. Issue US 9/4/20

AMS 9/4

2. To, by Comms. [illegible]

No. 3711 S. Dt. 5.4.20.

Enquires under what circumstances [illegible] Sri Anjaneya idol was [illegible] Chattram [illegible] this idol around [illegible] Swamis were [illegible] Chattram building after its completion in 1849. etc

NOTE—Contn sheet.

AMS

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

Any File No. 571 of 1919.

Serial No.	
3	From the D.C. Hassan, Letter No. Roc 2137/16 dt 4/5/20.
	Requests that a copy of letter no 601 dt 3.3.20 from D.C Hassan to Govt. may be sent, as the same is not traceable in his office.
B (200-92)	30) The letter is a pretty long one running to 9 pages. Draft forwarding a copy is subd. for approval or other orders.
	31) 11/5/20 11/5/20 11/5/21
4.	To, by. Commr. Hassan Dist. No. 4012 dt. 18.5.20. Forwards the copy of the letter as asked for & awaits reply to SI 2 supra
5	From the D.C. Hassan, Letter no. 2137/16 dt 6-5-21.
	that when the chief the idols of ri[illegible] in broad [illegible] a fig tree near the sacrificial [illegible] they are still there. that the account Engr. states that no [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

made as to ... of the Deities ... for the reco... request that the ... Rs 1461- for reinstallation of ... may be sanctioned.

32) The contractor Puttasamaiya, who was examined, has stated as follows:-

33) When the repairs of the chattram were undertaken, the small idol of Sri Anjaneya & the stone idol of Sri Subrahmanyeshwara, which were in the chattram, were removed and placed under a fig tree, near the chattram; that they are still there; that the estimate for about Rs 25000/- then sanctioned for the chattram reconstruction ~~and~~ also provided for the reinstallation of the deities that as all the estimated works were not completed, the reinstallation of the deities also was ~~was~~ not done and that he is fully aware of the above facts.

34. The Executive Engr. to whom a reference had been made, states that no such provision was made

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

Sanctd
in the estimate

35 The estimate for Rs 146/- subd by the Dy: comr for sanction is for the reinstallation of the Sri Anjaneya deity only & not for both, though in his letter now read, he ~~says~~ uses the plural term of deities.

36 It will be seen from the Shekdar's statement, that separate place has been provided for in the new chattram for the reinstallation of the deities.

37. The D. C. states in his letter that the devotees are very anxious to have the Anjaneya idol reinstalled in the temple provided for the purpose within the building.

38. After the reinstallation of the Sri Anjaneya deity, the D. C. recommends sanction to the entertainment of an archak on Rs 7/- per mensem and the grant of a paditara of Rs 3/- per month the total recurring expenditure of Rs 120/- per annum being met from the annual ~~ca~~ cash grant of Rs 1044 allowed for the chattram.

39. So, the points for orders are (1)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | May File No. of 19

Serial No.

(1) whether the estimate for Rs 1461- for the reinstallation of the Sri Anjeneyaswami may be sanctd

(2) whether the annual recurring expenditure of Rs 120 for padiyara & archaks pay may be sanctd.;

(3) whether it is necessary to send for the sanctd estimate from the P. W. D & examine whether there is no provision there for the reinstallation of the deities.

8D 17.5.24 40) If the deities had been kept safe at the renovation of the Chattram, it is not necy that they should both be installed now. The estimate sanctioned for the reconstruction of the Chattram building is likely to have made provision for the instn of the deities also & may perhaps be called for and then the question of the present bill being sanctd taken up for consideration.

Rd 17/5/24 41) Yes; may be done 17/5/24

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mg File No. 571 of 1919

Serial No.	
	42) Draft letter to D C. Snbd SD 18/5/21 DL 18/5/21 43) Issue 24/5/21
6	To, by Comm Hassan Distt. No. 4167 dt. 20.5.1921 Requisn to obtain & forward for Govt sanction the estimate. Sanctd for the Reconstruction of the ~~stone~~ Chattram at Bisle
8	From the Dy: Comr., Hassan Dt., Letter No. Roc 2137 dt 16-17 dt 14-6-21. Forwards the original estimate amounting to Rs 12,175 & the modified estimate for Rs 17,433 Sanctd. for the reconstruction of the Bisle Sri Ramadevara chattram, Manjarabad Tq. &c. 44) Looking into the estimate, it will be seen that no ~~expenditure~~ provision has been made for the installation of the Deities of the temple, ~~which should form part of the original estimate.~~ 45) Snbd for orders as to whether the estimate for Rs 146 sent by the Dy. Comr may be sanctd.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

SD 21/6/21 DL 21/6

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mis File No. 5-71 of 1919

Serial No.

46) Yes. Put up a draft
21/6/21

47) In the Dy. Comrs letter no. 2137 dt 16 & 10-3-20 (Sl. 1 of the file), in submitting for sanction an estimate for Rs 146/- for reinstalling the Sri Anjaneya deity in the new chattram at Biole, he has requested that a provision of Rs 60/- per mensem should be made out of the tasdik grant of Rs 1044 for the chattram, for the pay of the archak and paditara deeparadhane of the deity. Before putting up a draft, as directed above, orders are solicited on the latter point in the Dy: Comrs letter. Subd for orders -

28.6.21

28/6/21

48) Read also the Archaks petition for reopening pooja and the Report of Mysore Police in these temples before pooja stands stopped? We recall seeing that the Anjeneya temple has yielding one seer of rice per diem and on the other points noted above

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mys File No. S`71 of 1919

Serial No.	
	I would like to have information W/29/7
ST 9/8	49) Draft calling for the information is subd.- 82 1-7-21 Dt 7/7/21 50) Issue 12/7/21
8	To, Dy. Comm. Hassan Dist. No. 61 D. 8-7-21. Enquires that the archaks were being paid for Puja & Nityakatla services in the two temples of Sri Anjaneya & Sri Sakkaramaya Swami below - Puja & ors. Nityas in the Bisle Chattram.
9	From the Dy: Comr., Hassan Dist., Letter No. C 2137-16 D 13-7-21. Forwards a statement showing the scale of expenditure that was originally sanctd ~~in 14~~ for the chattram, 51) The scale of expenditure of the chattram shows that the archak was paid Rs 2-6 a per. mensem and also rice of the value of Rs 2/- per mensem - There is no separate provision for the Nyakatla expenditure of the temples in the chattram, as Rs 50/-

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

was provided to meet the cost of daily feeding in the chattram, including the cost of rice allowance to the chattram estabt & nelumidars -

52) The present proposal of the Dy: Comr is that the archak may be given a pay of Rs 7/- per mensem, + Rs 3/- for paditara, the total expenditure ~~of~~ Rs 10/- per mensem or Rs 120/- per annum being ~~in~~ proposed to be met from the savings of Rs ~~150~~ 175 per ~~annum~~ annum in the scale of expenditure -

May 25/-

Subd for orders on the two points noted in paragraph

8D
18/7/21 Sd 18.7.21

53) Why not keep the pay at Rs 4½ as at present?

54) Is the Tahsildar necessary? Why not allow the Dept the land for the Chattram? What is the practice at Jaffna? Sd 21/7/21

Subd

55) A kind perusal of the scale of expenditure of the chattrams sanctd in May 1913 will show that no provision exists for daily feeding in the chattrams

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mug File No. 571 of 1919

Serial No

as such no cooked rice will be available for daily naivedya to the chattram deity. So, separate paditara appears to be necessary.

55) As regards the fixing of the archak's pay at Rs 7/-, it may, perhaps, be stated that an enhanced pay has been proposed to compensate for the loss of rice allowance. Subd for orders.

SD 21/7/24

Rs 4-6-0 57) The old pay was Rs 2-6-0 (Rs 2 in cash & Rs 2-6-0 in the shape of rice). It was now proposed Rs 5/-, and a Mysorean Rs 3 pay be made for Palghat.

58) Put up a draft

21/7/24

The Member to know d.s.?

? Where is this.

(Subd
The question was one of the file Circular ... to the members (by mistake) without the draft)
SD

Recd 25.7.24

Draft order subd. I had yet marked this SD RG 1/8/24 file on 21-7-21 as duly for submission to the Member and the Branch was written in Secy

Asst Member 1/8/24

Asst Member 1/8/21

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 19

Serial No.	
812-79	
3.8.7	
	Box proposed Rec'd S. S. 2
	1 Issue
	2 Amount due Office Copy of the Scale 21/5/8/21
10	To. D.C Hassan & Comptr. No. 787-8 dy. 15-8-21 Sanctions the estimate for Rs 146/- for the Reinstallation of the Sri Anjaneya Swamy Deity in the Chattram & modifies the Scale of expdre. of the instn. in regard to the pay & Padtara of the Archaka.
11	From the D.C. Hassan Distt., letter no. Roc 2137 dy 16-17/Mis. dy 10.1.22. I Submits for sanction a bill for Rs 144-0-3 on account of expenditure actually incurred for the reinstallation of the Sri Anjaneya Deity in the chattram at Bisle out of the ~~Sanctd~~ Sanctd estimate for Rs 146 there for and ~~He~~ states that one Gundu Rao has consented to perform puja once in 8 days and on all

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mg File No. 571 of 1919.

Serial No.	
	days during the Barabazar Sankar fame on the poor remuneration of Rs 5/- offered
9/	The bill, which gives all the details of expenditure, is in Kannada and has not been countersigned by the Dy: Comrs. -
	A Draft letter returning the bill for the Dy: Comr's countersignature is subd.
	24.2.22 24/2/22
	25/2/22
12	To The Dy: Comr, Hassan dis No: 4402 dt 13th Dec 1922 Returns the bill for Countersignature of the Deputy [illegible]
	1 Sno
13	From the D. C. Hassan., letter no. Roc 2137 dt 16-17 dt 27 2.22. Returns the bill duly countersigned for Rs 144-0-3, being the amount expended in connection with the reinstallation of the Sri Anjaneya Dist the chattram at Bisle.
	Draft approving of the Dy: Comr's action and sanctg the bill, is subd.
	24-3-22 25/3/22
	27/3/22

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mun. File No. 571 of 1919

Serial No.	
	Typed draft subd.
	28/3/22 28/3/22
	Secret. Member 29/3/22
5315-116 5.4.22	Draft approved
	2.4.22
14	No. 5711-29 dt. 15th April 22
	do. The D.C. & the Comptroller Lawchinstan
	Rs 144-0-3

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 19 .

Serial No.	

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

1787
9 20
Rev
571-19

24295

From

B. VENKOBA RAO, Esq., B.A.,

Deputy Commissioner,
HASSAN DISTRICT.

To T.E. Jayarama Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.
Secretary to Government,
Muzrai Department,
Bangalore.

Dated 10th March 1920.

Despatched -3-20

Received

General No. 2137-
No.

Enclosure No.

Forwarding for sanction an estimate for Rs.146/- for reinstalling the "Anjaneya" deity at the Sree - Ramadevara Chattram at Bisle in the Manjarabad Taluk.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
HASSAN DISTRICT

Dated, Hassan, the 10th March 1920

From

B. VENKOBA RAO, Esq., B.A..
Deputy Commissioner.
HASSAN DISTRICT.

To

T. L. Jayarama Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Muzrai Department, Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honour to state that it will be seen from the accompanying correspondence ending with the Saklespur Sub Division Officer's No. R.O.C.118-18 dated 2nd March 1920, that there was an "Anjaneya Swami" deity in the old Chatram at Bisle in the Manjarabad Taluk. When the new Chatram was built the idol was removed and kept elsewhere and consequently the charges for Puja and Padi thara allowed therefore were discontinued vide Pherist No.2. Thus the new chatram came to be without its presiding deity.

2. It is reported that at the time of the Santarpane in this chatram during the Champa Shashti car festival at Subramanya, some - time back, many an orthodox Brahman refused to mess in the Chattram on the score that there was no presiding deity in the building and further that many pilgrims proceeding to Subramanya made an earnest appeal to the then Sub Division Officer for the installation of a deity vide Sub Division Officer's No.2137 dated 8th March 1917.

3. In these circumstances the reinstallation of the deity in the Chatram seems to be a matter of pressing necessity. Since the new Chattram is also provided with a Garbhankana with ample room for complete Pradakshina, an estimate for Rs.96/- was at first prepared in September 1919 for the reinstallation and the Sub Division Officer has now forwarded a revised estimate for Rs.146/- may kindly be sanctioned, the cost being met out of Rs.227-1-1 at the credit of the institution, as per accounts furnished

by the Comptroller.

4. This necessitates for the performance of Puja and other services, the revival of the original padethara and other grants and I request that sanction may be kindly accorded to the entertainment of an Archak on a pay of at least Rs.7/- a month, and the grant of a Padithara of Rs.3/- a month involving a recurring expenditure of Rs.10/- per mensem or Rs.120/- per annum. This charge will be met from the amount of Rs.175/- shown, in the scale sanctioned in Government Order No.542-4 Muz. 225-12-4 dated 15th August 1913, as savings out of the annual Cash grant of Rs.1044-0-0 allowed for the chatram. The scale as thus revised is detailed in the enclosed statement.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.

Statement showing the income and the scale of expenditure in the Sree Ramadevara Chattram at Bisle in the Manjarabad Taluq as per G.O. No.542-4 Muz. 25-12-4 dated 15th August 1913.

No.	Receipts.	Rs.	A.	P.	No.	Expenditure Items.	Amount Rs.	A.	P.	Remarks.
Cash grant		1044	0	0	1.	Allowance to Taluk Muzrai Gumastha	120	0	0	per annum
					2.	Watchman	84	0	0	"
					3.	Contribution to Chik aballapur Chattram	150	0	0	G.O.No.33-6M.F. 332-08-4 dated 7th July 1909.
					4.	Feeding in Marnhalli Chattram	100	0	0	G.O.No.817-8 M. 204-11-2 dated 14th October 1912.
					5.	do. in Bisle during Champashashti	350	0	0	per annum.
					6.	Minor repairs to Chattram	25	0	0	do.
					7.	Contribution towards the pay of the Muzrai clerk in the Deputy Commissioner's Office	40	0	0	do.
					8.	Archak for worshipping the Anjaneya deity proposed to be installed	84	0	0	)
					9.	Nithyakatle expenses	36	0	0	) per annum
						Total ...	989	0	0	
						Savings .	55	0	0	
Total ...		1044	0	0		Total ...	1044	0	0	

N. B. Items 8 and 9 have to be newly sanctioned.

Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

( )

the 191 .

Date of issue 24.4.20

Signed by.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No. 371 Excess Lic

To The Deputy [illegible]

Hambantota District.

Sir,

With reference to your

Letter No 2127/4 dated

10.3.20 forwarding for

Sanction an estimate for

for Rs 116/- for [illegible]

the Sri Vijayaraja Pirivena

at [illegible]

Sri Ratana Thera [illegible]

at Binduwewa [illegible]

over.

Talak, I am directed
to enquire ~~from~~ and
what circumstances
the idol was removed
from the Chithiram
and where it is now
kept.

2 From the old
records ~~of~~ of your
~~office~~ that the
new Chathiram was
built in 1899 and
it is not clear why
on the completion
of the Chathiram
building this idol
as also the idol of
Subrahmanya swamy
referred to in your
~~office~~ letter No 601
dy 3rd March 90 was
not duly installed

Temple provided
the purpose ~~in the~~ within the
I am

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 1744—GPB—30,000—19-2-19

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

to request that you will be so good as to enquire into the matter and submit a further report. ~~Stating~~ Regarding also where the idol of Siri Kalyana Ranganaswami is now kept.

3. The Ver received with your letter are returned herewith for reference and re-transmission.

4. An early report is requested.

I have &c.

W. J. 9/4/20

Secretary to Govt.

Mina 20/4

Redraft)

17/4/20

17-4

GPB—20,000—16-2 14

REV No. 2269
19 MAY 20

3 1.59

From

B. VENKOBA RAO Esq., B.A.

Deputy Commissioner
HASSAN DISTRICT

To T.A.Jayarama Iye, Esq, B.A., B.L.
Secretary to the Government
of H.H. the Maharaja of
Mysore, Muzrai Department,
B a n g a l o r e.

Dated the 1st May 1920.

Despatched 4-5-20

Received

General No. R.O.C 2137-16/mco
No

Enclosure No. Nil.

S U B J E C T

Requesting to send copy of letter No 601 dated 3rd March 1920 from the --- Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District, to Government relating to the installation of an Anjaneya deity at the Sreerama Devara Chatram at Belsle in the Manjarabad Taluk.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
HASSAN DISTRICT.

Dated, Hassan, the 1st May ...1920..

From

B. VENKOBA RAO, ESQ., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
HASSAN DISTRICT.

To

T.E.Jayarama Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness The Maharaja of Mysore.
Muzrai *Department.*, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 3711/ Muz. 571-19-2 dated the 24th April 1920, calling for additional information regarding the installation of an Anjaneya deity in the Sreeramadevara Chatram at Bisle in the Manjarabsd Taluk, I have the honour to request you to be so good as send a copy of this office letter No. 601 dated the 3rd March 1890 as the same cannot be traced here.

I have the honour to be,
S i r,
Your most obedient servant,

B. Venkoba Rao

Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.

M.V.

G. R. S. VI—G/32.

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to ..2260.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT)
(Mus
, *the* *191*

Date of issue .. ..18·5·20....

Signed by Mr. A. M.....

Section Imperial
File No. 571-9
Serial No. 4

No. 4012 Confidential

To

The Dy: Comr, Hassan Dt.

Sir,

As requested in your letter No. R.C.C. 2137-16, dtd 4-5-20, I am directed to forward herewith a copy of letter no. ~~illegible~~ dtd 23/3/20 from the Dy: Comr Hassan Dt to the Chief Secretary to Govt

I have etc

Mr 11/5/20
for Secretary
P. Mus. Dept

SP
11-5-20

Copied by

Examined by

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
HASSAN DISTRICT.

Dated, Hassan, the 6th May ...19 21

From

B. VENKOBA RAO, ESQ., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
HASSAN DISTRICT.

To

T.F.Jeyarama Iyer, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness The Maharaja of Mysore.
Muzrai *Department.*
B a n g a l o r e.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.3711/Mus.371-19-3 dated 24-4-21 enquiring under what circumstances the idol of Sree Anjaneyaswamy was not duly installed in the newly constructed Chattram at Bisale, I have the honor to state that enquiries were made in the matter during my recent visit to Subramanya and it was learnt from an old contractor Puttasamiah that a provision of Rs 500/- had been made for the reinstallation of the diety in the estimate sanctioned for the reconstruction of this Chattram;but as all the items in the estimate were not worked out, the reinstallation of the diety which was one of the ---- items of the estimate was not also given effect to. The Executive Engineer, Hassan Division to whom a reference was made on the subject, in his No.2137-13 dated 28-4-21 states that no such provision has been made in the sanctioned estimate.

2. The Anjaneya Deity as well as another idol viz, Subramanya swamy are both near the chattram, the latter is under a big tree. The devotees are very anxious to have the Anjeneya Deity idol reinstalled in the temple provided for the purpose within the building. I therefore request that the estimate for Rs 500/- for

DIARY No. 2335

20-21

Finance

571-19

5

From

B. VENKOBA RAO, Esq., B.A.,

7A936 *Deputy Commissioner*
HASSAN DISTRICT

To

T. Jagannatha Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.
Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
Bangalore.

Dated 2-3-21

Despatched

Received 9 - MAR 1921

GEN & REV. SECTT

General No. 2137-16
No Revs.

Enclosure No. 4/one file

Submitting a further report re the installation of Sri Marjoneya Deity in the Basalu Sri Ramadevara Chennakeshavaswamy Temple in the Manjarabad Taluk.

for installing the deities, already submitted may kindly be sanctioned as early as possible. The entire file of vernacular papers ending with Hassan Executive Engineer's No.171 dated 20-4-1921 is also sent herewith for reference.

I have the honor to be,
S i r,
Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 2335

General and Revenue Secretariat

(May)

, *the* *191* .

Date of issue 20th May 21

Signed by Mr. T. L. Jayarama

Section

File No.

Serial No

No. 4167

To

The Dy: Comr., Hassan Distt.

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter no. 2137/16 dt. 6-5-21 in the matter of the reinstallation of the Sri Anjaneyaswamy vigraha in the newly built Biole Sri Ramadevaru chattram, Manjarabad Taluk, I am directed to request that the estimate sanctioned for the reconstruction of the chattram may be obtained

over.

rom the Executive Engineer,
Hassan Division, and forwarded, at a very early date
to Govt. for reference ~~& return~~.

I have etc

Secretary
Muz: Deptt

89
18/5/21

84
18/5/21

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
HASSAN DISTRICT.

Dated, Hassan, the 14th. June. *19* 21

2556

20-21
Muz

RC 2137 of 1917 / Confidential 2 Enclosures

From

GEN & REV. B. VENKOBA RAO, ESQ., B.A.,
Mysore
JUN 1921
Deputy Commissioner,
HASSAN DISTRICT.

To,

T.E.Jeyarama Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness The Maharaja of Mysore.
Muzrai *Department.*
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.4167/Muz.571-19-6 dated 20th May 1921 calling for the submission of the estimate --- sanctioned for the reconstruction of the Bisale Sri Ramadevara Chattram in the Manjarabad Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith both the original estimate amounting to Rs. 12175 and the modified estimate for Rs. 17433/- sanctioned in Muzrai Secretary's No.18 dated 18-7-1892 and 64 dated 26-3-1896 respectively received from the Executive Engineer, Hassan Division, with his No. 240 dated 3/6th June 1921.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Treasury Assistant Commissioner,
For Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.
(Absent from Head Quarters)

From

B. VENKOBA RAO [illegible]

Department [illegible]
Hyderabad

To

[illegible]

Dated [illegible]

Despatched

Received

General No.
[illegible]

Encoding No.

Subject

Submitting the estimate sanctioned for the reconstruction of the Nizam Tree Landowners Chattram in the Anjaneya Pallel.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 2556

Section Inspn

File No. 571–19

Serial No 8

General and Revenue Secretariat

(Mng)

, *the* 8 *191* .

No. 61 Confdl

Date of issue 8.7.21

Signed by Mr. DL Jl-inspr

To The Dy: Comr:, Hassan Distt.

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No. Roc 2137 of 16-6-21 & 14-6-21 in the matter of the re-installation of the Sri Anjaneya deity in the newly constructed chattram at Bisle, Manjarabad Taluk, I am directed to enquire what the archaks were being paid for performing puja and

over.

on account of Nityakale
in the two temples of Sri
Anjaneya & Sri Subrahmanyeshwara
before puja service was stopped
there.

2. The Ver: records are ~~return~~
returned herewith for reference
and ~~[illegible]~~ retransmission.

I have etc

U/21/7/24
for Secretary
Myz: Dy Supdt

1/7/24

BL
1/7/24

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
HASSAN DISTRICT.

Dated, Hassan, the 13th July 1901

From

B. VENKOBA RAO, ESQ., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
HASSAN DISTRICT.

To

T.R.Jeyarama Iyer,... ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness The Maharaja of Mysore.
Muzrai *Department.*
B a n g a l o r e.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.61/Muz.571-19-8 dated the 5th instant enquiring what the Archaks were being padd for performing Puja and on account of Nityakatle in the two temples of Sree Anjaneya and Sree Subramanya swamy before Puja service was stopped at Disale chattram, I have the honor to forward herewith a statement showing the scale of expenditure that was originally sanctioned. From the statement it may be observed that the Archak was paid R. 2-8-0 per mensem and a sum of R. 50/- was paid per month for the purpose of daily santarpane.

2. The vernacular records are retransmitted.

I have the honor to be,
S i r,
Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.



1641

From

B. VENKOBA RAO, Esq., B.A.,

Deputy Commissioner,
HASSAN DISTRICT.

To

To
The Jeyarama Iyer, Esq, B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to Govern ent,
Muzrai Department,
B a n g a l o r e.

Dated 13-7-21.

Despatched

GEN & REV. SECT.

Received 15 JUL 1921

General No. C2137-16
No. This

Enclosure No. One file 1 out Vernacular

Forwarding a statement showing the scale of expenditure that was originally sanctioned for performing puja at Pisale Chattram.

G.R.S. VI-71]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to... 123

General and Revenue Secretariat

(Mug)

, *the* 191

Date of issue... 15-8-21

Signed by... [illegible]

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Section

File No. 5, 1

Serial No. 10

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

787-8

E

Read— 1) G.O. No. 1043-5/Mg. 7 38-95 d 26-3-1896 sanctioning a revised estimate for Rs 17433 for the reconstruction of the Bisle Sri Ramadevaru chattiram in the Manjarabad Taluk.

2) Correspondence ending with letter No. 2137-16/mis d 13-7-21 Submitting for sanction an estimate for Rs 146/- for the reinstallation of the Sri Anjaneya Swami deity in the

reconstructed chattram at Bisle, Manjarabad Taluk, the cost being proposed to be met out of Rs 227-1-1 available at the credit of the institution; and also requesting sanction to a recurring expenditure of Rs 10/- per mensem or Rs 120/- per annum for the entertainment of an archak on a pay of Rs 7/- per mensem and for a Paditara of Rs 3/- a month, the charge being proposed to be met out of the savings from the annual cash tasdik of ~~the tamfa~~ Rs 1044 of the chattram.

List of enclosures.

Order:- 787-8 ——— for: one file

Memo: 571-19-10 B

The Dy: Comr: states that many orthodox Brahmins

Copied by

Examined by

q to Subramanya the Champa Shasti decline to take

WD 1741—GPB—30,000—17-3-19

G. R. S. G/33]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

take their food in the chattram at Bisle on the score that there is no presiding Deity ~~in the chattram,~~ and that the reinstallation of the deity in the chattram seems, therefore, to be ~~no~~ a matter of pressing necessity; and that the new chattram is also provided with a Garbhagriha with ample room for complete Pradakshina; and requests sanction to the above estimate and to the recurring expenditure proposed -

2. In the above circumstances, Govt. are pleased to sanction the estimate for Rs 14 6/- for the reinstallation of the Sri Anjaneya Swamy Deity in the chattram, the charge being met as proposed.

3. As regards the recurring expenditure ~~proposed~~

WD 2230—GPB—1,00,000—23-7-20

Govt observe that the old pay of the archak was Rs 4-6-0 (Rs 2 in cash and Rs 2-6-0 in the shape of rice) and, therefore, direct that his pay now fixed at Rs 5/- per mensem and that a provision of Rs 3/- per mensem also be made for Padihara, the recurring cost of Rs 96/- per annum being met from the chattram savings, as proposed

4. The sanctd scale of expenditure of the chattram will be modified, accordingly

2/8/24
Secretary
Muz: Deptt

RG 1/8/24

8/8/24

To

The Dy: Comr, Hassan etc

Ref to yr: records, wkld the sanctd estimate

Comptd to Govt.

Copy to office section

Rec'd 5.8.24

Acc 21379/16-17

mis

E/One file with vouchers

9/10-1-22

From

B.V. [illegible], Esquire, B.A.,

Deputy Commissioner,

Hazara Division.

2750

4-22

Fmn,

571-19-11

Jm 11

12/1/22

To

T.L. Jenner, Esquire, B.A.; B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of [illegible],

[illegible],

Sir,

Adverting to Government [illegible] dated 25th August 1921 [illegible] the reinstallation of the [illegible] Biside, I herewith Bank, I [illegible] reinstallation of money [illegible] till the 7th of that [illegible] occasion to which the [illegible] tioner of Agriculture [illegible] secure with the assistance of [illegible]

the Peripathetic [illegible] course or return portion [illegible] the cattle for which [illegible] very endeavour [illegible] -llotment. As it will [illegible] purpose and the unspent [illegible] the Treasury [illegible] kindly be sanctioned.

2. In accordance [illegible] (Rs. [illegible] tion is for the [illegible] under report [illegible] of the [illegible]

-t

[illegible]

From [illegible]

To [illegible]

Dated [illegible]

Despatched

Received

General No. Rev 2137 J 16-17

No.

Enclosure No. one file with vouchers

Submitting a report. Re. the installation of Anjaneya deity at Bisale Manjarabad Taluk

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 2780

Section Mucy
File No. 572-19
Serial No 12

General and Revenue Secretariat
(Mucy)
, *the* *191* .

No. 4402
Mysore

Date of issue 13-2-22

To The Dy: Comr, Hassan Dt.

Signed by Mr J E J Kyle

Sir,

I am directed to return the bill for Rs 144-0-3 received with your letter no. Roc 2137 of 16-17/Miss dt 10-1-22 for your countersignature and retransmission.

2. The ver: records are also returned

I have etc

Secretary
Mucy-Dept

8D
4.2.22

over. 4/2/22

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

Ave 21397 16-17

mis

Ef one file

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,

Kolar District,

Dated the 31st December 1921.

From

B.Rowlandson Rice, Esquire, B.A.,

Deputy Commissioner,

Kolar District.

To

T.E.Jayaratnam, Esquire, B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, Mysore Department,

Bangalore.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 4409/Mun. 571-19-3 dated the 13th instant, I have the honor to forward the bill duly discharged for Rs 144-0-0 being the amount expended in connection with the installation of Anjaneya Deity in the Chavadi at Kolar.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,

Kolar District.

Rec'd 16-3-22

Ack 3-3-22

Ans 15-12-22

B/L 1/3/22

3597

21-22-

Mun

571-19-13

19

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No. ____
No.

Enclosure No.

571-19-14

Proceedings of the Government of H. H.
the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read --

C.O.No.787-8/Muz.571-19-10 dated 15th August 1921 sanctioning an estimate for Rs.146/- for the reinstallation of the Sri Anjeneya Diety in the Sri Ramadevaru Chatiram at Bisle, Manjarabad taluk.

2. Correspondence ending with letter No.R.O.C.2137 of 16-17 dated 27-2-1922 from the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan Dist., stating that he was present at Bisle on the occasion of the installation ceremony and that it was conducted in a befitting manner that as no one else came forward to accept the archakship of the newly installed Sri Anjaneyaswami on account of the poor pay provided for it, one Gundu Rao, a resident of Subrahmanya, who consented to conduct the puja of the diety once in 8 days and on all days during the Barahazar Santarpane, has been appointed as the archak and submitting for sanction a bill for Rs.144-0-3, being the actual amount spent on the installation ceremony, the balance of Rs.1-15-9 having been credited to the Treasury.

Order -- No. 571-2 Grant-archa

Dated Bangalore, 15-4-22

The action taken by the Deputy Commr. is approved and the bill for Rs.144-0-3 sanctioned

Secretary to Govt.,
Muz. Dept.

Fair Draft
87

To

The Dy.Commr., Hassan Dist., returning
the sanctioned bill and ver.records.

The Comptroler to Govt.

GKV